



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,723	10/30/2000	Joel Erwin Goldstein	06076-USA	6932

23543 7590 11/04/2003

AIR PRODUCTS AND CHEMICALS, INC.  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
7201 HAMILTON BOULEVARD  
ALLENTOWN, PA 181951501

EXAMINER

REDDICK, MARIE L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1713

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/699,723

Applicant(s)

GOLDSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Judy M. Reddick

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

1. *The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:*

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

2. *The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:*

1. *Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.*
2. *Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.*
3. *Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.*
4. *Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.*

3. *Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berghofer et al (U.S. 6,211,400) in combination with Applicants' own disclosure as per reasons stated in the previous Office Action per paper no. 13, 05.21.03, paragraph no. 7.*

**Response to Arguments**

4. *Applicant's arguments filed 08.25.03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.*

*Relative to Berghofer et al w/Applicants' own disclosure*—*It is urged and maintained that the instantly claimed invention is obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103 over Berghofer et al w/Applicants' own disclosure as per reasons set forth in the Grounds of Rejection per paper no. 13, 05.21.03. The crux of Counsel's arguments appears to hinge on the reduction in formaldehyde not reported by Berghofer et al, in fact, Berghofer et al state at col. 4, lines 22-24 that the compounds disclosed therein have a reducing action comparable to formaldehyde sulfoxylate; but they do not eliminate formaldehyde before,*

Art Unit: 1713

*during, or after use. It is tenable that the sulfinic acid derivatives(reducing agents) used in the emulsion polymerization technique of Berghofer et al would generate a final polymer emulsion governed by a reduction in formaldehyde since the vinyl acetate based polymer emulsion of Berghofer et al, as modified, is essentially the same as the claimed vinyl acetate based polymer emulsion and there is nothing iron clad on this record diffusing this issue. Furthermore, "do not eliminate formaldehyde" would necessary translate to "a reduction in formaldehyde". In any event, even if it turns out that the Examiner has somehow missed the boat, it is not clear as to what applicants are doing differently from Berghofer et al to generate a reduction in formaldehyde which Counsel argues is not the case in Berghofer. Counsel is herein reminded that a reference is evaluated, as a whole, for what it fairly teaches and in no way limited to bits and pieces and, to this end, Berghofer et al @ col. 4, lines 25-27 states that the novel compounds(reducing agents) are used in those fields where evolution of formaldehyde is undesired. Furthermore, the recitation of an additional advantage associated with doing what the prior art suggests does not lend patentability to an otherwise unpatentable invention. More specifically, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See Ex parte Obiaya, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).*

#### **Conclusion**

**5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

*A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be*

Art Unit: 1713

*calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.*

*Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Judy M. Reddick whose telephone number is (703)308-4346. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m..*

*If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (703)308-2450. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.*

*Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-8183.*

*Judy M. Reddick*  
Judy M. Reddick  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1713

JMR *Jme*  
10.31.03